

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bulletin

RECEIVED

FEB 5 - 1960

MIAMI UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

FEB 2 - 1960

Vol. XLII, No. 1074

January 25, 1960

THE STATE OF THE UNION • *Address of the President
to the Congress* 111

PRESIDENT EXPRESSES VIEWS ON WORLD COURT
AND DISARMAMENT • *Exchange of Letters Between
President Eisenhower and Senator Hubert H. Humphrey* . . 128

CANADIAN-UNITED STATES COOPERATION FOR
PEACE • *by Ambassador Richard B. Wigglesworth* 121

THE TASK OF PEACEFUL COOPERATION • *Remarks
by George N. Shuster* 131

For index see inside back cover

Vol. 42
No. 1074



THE
OFFICIAL
WEEKLY RECORD
OF
UNITED STATES
FOREIGN POLICY

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bulletin

VOL. XLII, No. 1074 • PUBLICATION 6934

January 25, 1960

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$8.50, foreign \$12.25
Single copy, 25 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 20, 1958).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Office of Public Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.

The

A

Mr. I

86r

Sev

one lo

was th

United

resour

peace

ples ev

shared

Ameri

My

Ameri

tions t

First

ination

that w

equilib

protect

With

session

mankin

annihil

of toda

colors e

Ther

tion, an

our res

especial

These t

All t

striving

Only

¹H. Do

hower re

before a

January

The State of the Union

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE CONGRESS¹

MR. PRESIDENT, MR. SPEAKER, MEMBERS OF THE 86TH CONGRESS, MY FELLOW CITIZENS:

Seven years ago I entered my present office with one long-held resolve overriding all others. I was then, and remain now, determined that the United States shall become an ever more potent resource for the cause of peace—realizing that peace cannot be for ourselves alone, but for peoples everywhere. This determination is, I know, shared by the entire Congress—indeed, by all Americans.

My purpose today is to discuss some features of America's position, both at home and in her relations to others.

First, I point out that for us, annual self-examination is made a definite necessity by the fact that we now live in a divided world of uneasy equilibrium, with our side committed to its own protection and against aggression by the other.

With both sections of this divided world in possession of unbelievably destructive weapons, mankind approaches a state where mutual annihilation becomes a possibility. No other fact of today's world equals this in importance—it colors everything we say, plan, and do.

There is demanded of us vigilance, determination, and the dedication of whatever portion of our resources that will provide adequate security, especially provide a real deterrent to aggression. These things we are doing.

All these facts emphasize the importance of striving incessantly for a just peace.

Only through the strengthening of the spiritual,

intellectual, economic, and defensive resources of the free world can we, in confidence, make progress toward this goal.

Second, we note that recent Soviet deportment and pronouncements suggest the possible opening of a somewhat less strained period in the relationships between the Soviet Union and the rest of the world. If these pronouncements be genuine, there is brighter hope of diminishing the intensity of past rivalry and eventually of substituting persuasion for coercion. Whether this is to become an era of lasting promise remains to be tested by actions.

Third, we now stand in the vestibule of a vast new technological age—one that, despite its capacity for human destruction, has an equal capacity to make poverty and human misery obsolete. If our efforts are wisely directed—and if our unremitting efforts for dependable peace begin to attain some success—we can surely become participants in creating an age characterized by justice and rising levels of human well-being.

Over the past year the Soviet Union has expressed an interest in measures to reduce the common peril of war.

While neither we nor any other free world nation can permit ourselves to be misled by pleasant promises until they are tested by performance, yet we approach this apparently new opportunity with the utmost seriousness. We must strive to break the calamitous cycle of frustrations and crises which, if unchecked, could spiral into nuclear disaster; the ultimate insanity.

Though the need for dependable agreements to assure against resort to force in settling disputes is apparent to both sides yet as in other issues dividing men and nations, we cannot expect

¹H. Doc. 241, 86th Cong., 2d sess. President Eisenhower read a slightly condensed version of the message before a joint session of the Congress on Jan. 7.

sudden and revolutionary results. But we must find some place to begin.

One obvious road on which to make a useful start is in the widening of communication between our two peoples. In this field there are, both sides willing, countless opportunities—most of them well known to us all—for developing mutual understanding, the true foundation of peace.

Another avenue may be through the reopening, on January 12, of negotiations looking to a controlled ban on the testing of nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, the closing statement from the Soviet scientists who met with our scientists at Geneva gives the clear impression that their conclusions have been politically guided.² Those of the British and American scientific representatives are their own freely formed, individual and collective opinions. I am hopeful that, as new negotiations begin, truth—not political opportunism—will guide the deliberations.

Still another field may be found in the field of disarmament, in which the Soviets have professed a readiness to negotiate seriously.³ They have not, however, made clear the plans they may have, if any, for mutual inspection and verification—the essential condition for any extensive measure of disarmament.

There is one instance where our initiative for peace has recently been successful. A multilateral treaty⁴ signed last month provides for the exclusively peaceful use of Antarctica, assured by a system of inspection. It provides for free and cooperative scientific research in that continent, and prohibits nuclear explosions there pending general international agreement on the subject. I shall transmit its text to the Senate for consideration and approval in the near future. The treaty is a significant contribution toward peace, international cooperation, and the advancement of science.

The United States is always ready to participate with the Soviet Union in serious discussion of these or any other subjects that may lead to peace with justice.

Certainly it is not necessary to repeat that the

United States has no intention of interfering in the internal affairs of any nation; by the same token we reject any attempt to impose its system on us or on other peoples by force or subversion.

This concern for the freedom of other peoples is the intellectual and spiritual cement which has allied us with more than 40 other nations in a common defense effort. Not for a moment do we forget that our own fate is firmly fastened to that of these countries; we will not act in any way which would jeopardize our solemn commitments to them.

We and our friends are, of course, concerned with self-defense. Growing out of this concern is the realization that all people of the free world have a great stake in the progress, in freedom, of the uncommitted and newly emerging nations. These peoples, desperately hoping to lift themselves to decent levels of living must not, by our neglect, be forced to seek help from, and finally become virtual satellites of, those who proclaim their hostility to freedom.

Their natural desire for a better life must not be frustrated by withholding from them necessary technical and investment assistance. This is a problem to be solved not by America alone, but also by every nation cherishing the same ideals and in position to provide help.

In recent years America's partners and friends in Western Europe and Japan have made great economic progress. Their newly found economic strength is eloquent testimony to the striking success of the policies of economic cooperation which we and they have pursued.

The international economy of 1960 is markedly different from that of the early postwar years. No longer is the United States the only major industrial country capable of providing substantial amounts of the resources so urgently needed in the newly developing countries.

To remain secure and prosperous themselves, wealthy nations must extend the kind of cooperation to the less fortunate members that will inspire hope, confidence, and progress. A rich nation can for a time, without noticeable damage to itself, pursue a course of self-indulgence, making its single goal the material ease and comfort of its own citizens—thus repudiating its own spiritual and material stake in a peaceful and prosperous society of nations. But the enmities it will incur, the isolation into which it will descend, and

² For a U.S. reply to a statement of the Soviet delegation, see BULLETIN of Jan. 18, 1960, p. 78.

³ For text of a communique issued by the Foreign Ministers of Canada, France, Italy, the United Kingdom, and the United States at Paris on Dec. 21, see *ibid.*, Jan. 11, 1960, p. 45.

⁴ For text, see *ibid.*, Dec. 21, 1959, p. 912.

the internal moral, spiritual, economic, and political softness that will be engendered, will, in the long term, bring it to disaster.

America did not become great through softness and self-indulgence. Her miraculous progress and achievements flow from other qualities far more worthy and substantial—

Adherence to principles and methods consonant with our religious philosophy;

A satisfaction in hard work;

The readiness to sacrifice for worthwhile causes;

The courage to meet every challenge;

The intellectual honesty and capacity to recognize the true path of her own best interests.

To us and to every nation of the free world, rich or poor, these qualities are necessary today as never before if we are to march together to greater security, prosperity, and peace.

I believe the industrial countries are ready to participate actively in supplementing the efforts of the developing nations to achieve progress.

The immediate need for this kind of cooperation is underscored by the strain in our international balance of payments. Our surplus from foreign business transactions has in recent years fallen substantially short of the expenditures we make abroad to maintain our military establishments overseas, to finance private investment, and to provide assistance to the less developed nations. In 1959 our deficit in balance of payments approached \$4 billion.

Continuing deficits of anything like this magnitude would, over time, impair our own economic growth and check the forward progress of the free world.

We must meet this situation by promoting a rising volume of exports and world trade. Further, we must induce all industrialized nations of the free world to work together to help lift the scourge of poverty from less fortunate nations. This will provide for better sharing of this burden and for still further profitable trade.

New nations, and others struggling with the problems of development, will progress only, regardless of any outside help, if they demonstrate faith in their own destiny and possess the will and use their own resources to fulfill it. Moreover, progress in a national transformation can be only gradually earned; there is no easy and quick way to follow from the ox cart to the jet plane. But, just as we drew on Europe for assistance in our

earlier years, so now do those new and emerging nations that have this faith and determination deserve help.

Over the last 15 years, 20 nations have gained political independence. Others are doing so each year. Most of them are woefully lacking in technical capacity and in investment capital; without free-world support in these matters they cannot effectively progress in freedom.

Respecting their need, one of the major focal points of our concern is the south Asian region. Here, in two nations alone, are almost 500 million people, all working, and working hard, to raise their standards, and, in doing so, to make of themselves a strong bulwark against the spread of an ideology that would destroy liberty.

I cannot express to you the depth of my conviction that, in our own and free-world interests, we must cooperate with others to help these people achieve their legitimate ambitions, as expressed in their different multiyear plans. Through the World Bank and other instrumentalities, as well as through individual action by every nation in position to help, we must squarely face this titanic challenge.

All of us must realize, of course, that development in freedom by the newly emerging nations, is no mere matter of obtaining outside financial assistance. An indispensable element in this process is a strong and continuing determination on the part of these nations to exercise the national discipline necessary for any sustained development period. These qualities of determination are particularly essential because of the fact that the process of improvement will necessarily be gradual and laborious rather than revolutionary. Moreover, everyone should be aware that the development process is no short-term phenomenon. Many years are required for even the most favorably situated countries.

I shall continue to urge the American people, in the interests of their own security, prosperity, and peace, to make sure that their own part of this great project be amply and cheerfully supported. Free-world decisions in this matter may spell the difference between world disaster and world progress in freedom.

Other countries, some of which I visited last month,⁵ have similar needs.

⁵ BULLETIN of Dec. 28, 1959, p. 931, and Jan. 11, 1960, p. 46.

A common meeting ground is desirable for those nations which are prepared to assist in the development effort. During the past year I have discussed this matter with the leaders of several western nations.

Because of its wealth of experience, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation could help with initial studies needed.⁶ The goal is to enlist all available economic resources in the industrialized free world—especially private investment capital. But I repeat that this help, no matter how great, can be lastingly effective only if it is used as a supplement to the strength of spirit and will of the people of the newly developing nations.

By extending this help we hope to make possible the enthusiastic enrollment of these nations under freedom's banner. No more startling contrast to a system of sullen satellites could be imagined. If we grasp this opportunity to build an age of productive partnership between the less fortunate nations and those that have already achieved a high state of economic advancement, we will make brighter the outlook for a world order based upon security, freedom, and peace. Otherwise, the outlook could be dark indeed. We face what may be a turning point in history, and we must act decisively.

As a nation we can successfully pursue these objectives only from a position of broadly based strength.

No matter how earnest is our quest for guaranteed peace, we must maintain a high degree of military effectiveness at the same time we are engaged in negotiating the issue of arms reduction. Until tangible and mutually enforceable arms reduction measures are worked out, we will not weaken the means of defending our institutions.

America possesses an enormous defense power. It is my studied conviction that no nation will ever risk general war against us unless we should be so foolish as to neglect the defense forces we now so powerfully support. It is worldwide knowledge that any nation which might be tempted today to attack the United States, even though our country might sustain great losses, would itself promptly suffer a terrible destruction. But I once again assure all peoples and all nations

⁶ For text of a communique issued by the Western heads of government at Paris on Dec. 21, see *ibid.*, Jan. 11, 1960, p. 43.

that the United States, except in defense, will never turn loose this destructive power.

During the past year our long-range striking power, unmatched today in manned bombers, has taken on new strength as the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile has entered the operational inventory. In 14 recent test launchings, at ranges of over 5,000 miles, Atlas has been striking on an average within 2 miles of the target. This is less than the length of a jet runway—well within the circle of total destruction. Incidentally, there was an Atlas firing last night. From all reports so far received, its performance conformed to the high standards I have described. Such performance is a great tribute to American scientists and engineers, who in the past 5 years have had to telescope time and technology to develop these long-range ballistic missiles, where America had none before.

This year, moreover, growing numbers of nuclear-powered submarines will enter our active forces, some to be armed with Polaris missiles. These remarkable ships and weapons, ranging the oceans, will be capable of accurate fire on targets virtually anywhere on earth. Impossible to destroy by surprise attack, they will become one of our most effective sentinels for peace.

To meet situations of less than general nuclear war, we continue to maintain our carrier forces, our many service units abroad, our always ready Army strategic forces and Marine Corps divisions, and the civilian components. The continuing modernization of these forces is a costly but necessary process, and is scheduled to go forward at a rate which will steadily add to our strength.

The deployment of a portion of these forces beyond our shores, on land and sea, is persuasive demonstration of our determination to stand shoulder-to-shoulder with our allies for collective security. Moreover, I have directed that steps be taken to program our military assistance to these allies on a longer range basis. This is necessary for a sounder collective defense system.

Next I refer to our program in space exploration, which is often mistakenly supposed to be an integral part of defense research and development.

We note that, first, America has made great contributions in the past 2 years to the world's fund of knowledge of astrophysics and space science. These discoveries are of present interest chiefly to the scientific community; but they are

important foundation stones for more extensive exploration of outer space for the ultimate benefit of all mankind.

Second, our military missile program, going forward so successfully, does not suffer from our present lack of very large rocket engines, which are so necessary in distant space exploration. I am assured by experts that the thrust of our present missiles is fully adequate for defense requirements.

Third, the United States is pressing forward in the development of large rocket engines to place vehicles of many tons into space for exploration purposes.

Fourth, in the meantime, it is necessary to remember that we have only begun to probe the environment immediately surrounding the earth. Using launch systems presently available, we are developing satellites to scout the world's weather; satellite relay stations to facilitate and extend communications over the globe; for navigation aids to give accurate bearings to ships and aircraft; and for perfecting instruments to collect and transmit the data we seek. This is the area holding the most promise for early and useful applications of space technology.

Fifth, we have just completed a year's experience with our new space law. I believe it deficient in certain particulars and suggested improvements will be submitted to the Congress shortly.

The accomplishment of the many tasks I have alluded to requires the continuous strengthening of the spiritual, intellectual, and economic sinews of American life. The steady purpose of our society is to assure justice, before God, for every individual. We must be ever alert that freedom does not wither through the careless amassing of restrictive controls or the lack of courage to deal boldly with the giant issues of the day.

A year ago, when I met with you, the Nation was emerging from an economic downturn, even though the signs of resurgent prosperity were not then sufficiently convincing to the doubtful. Today our surging strength is apparent to everyone; 1960 promises to be the most prosperous year in our history.

Yet we continue to be afflicted by nagging disorders.

Among current problems that require solution participated in by citizens as well as Government are—

The need to protect the public interest in situations of prolonged labor-management stalemate;

The persistent refusal to come to grips with a critical problem in one sector of American agriculture;

The continuing threat of inflation, together with the persisting tendency toward fiscal irresponsibility;

In certain instances the denial to some of our citizens of equal protection of the law.

Every American was disturbed by the prolonged dispute in the steel industry and the protracted delay in reaching a settlement.

We are all relieved that a settlement has at last been achieved in that industry. Percentage-wise, by this settlement the increase to the steel companies in employment costs is lower than in any prior wage settlement since World War II. It is also gratifying to note that despite the increase in wages and benefits several of the major steel producers have announced that there will be no increase in steel prices at this time. The national interest demands that in the period of industrial peace which has been assured by the new contract, both management and labor make every possible effort to increase efficiency and productivity in the manufacture of steel so that price increases can be avoided.

One of the lessons of this story is that the potential danger to the entire Nation of longer and greater strikes must be met. To insure against such possibilities we must of course depend primarily upon the good commonsense of the responsible individuals. It is my intention to encourage regular discussions between management and labor outside the bargaining table, to consider the interest of the public as well as their mutual interest in the maintenance of industrial peace, price stability, incentive for continuous investment, and economic growth. Both the Executive and the Congress will, I know, be watching developments with keenest interest.

To me, it seems almost absurd that the United States should recognize the need, and so earnestly to seek, for cooperation among the nations unless we can achieve voluntary, dependable, abiding cooperation among the important segments of our own free society. Without such cooperation we cannot prosper.

Failure to face up to basic issues in areas other than those of labor-management can cause serious

strains on the firm freedom supports of our society.

Agriculture is one of these areas.

Our basic farm laws were written 27 years ago, in an emergency effort to redress hardship caused by a worldwide depression. They were continued—and their economic distortions intensified—during World War II in order to provide incentives for production of food needed to sustain a war-torn world.

Today our farm problem is totally different. It is that of effectively adjusting to the changes caused by a scientific revolution. When the original farm laws were written, an hour's farm labor produced only one-fourth as much wheat as at present. Farm legislation is woefully out of date, ineffective, and expensive.

For years we have gone on with an outmoded system which not only has failed to protect farm income, but also has produced soaring, threatening surpluses. Our farms have been left producing for war while America has long been at peace.

Once again I urge Congress to enact legislation that will gear production more closely to markets, make costly surpluses more manageable, provide greater freedom in farm operations, and steadily achieve increased net farm incomes.

Another issue that we must meet squarely is that of living within our means. This requires restraint in expenditure, constant reassessment of priorities, and the maintenance of stable prices.

To do so we must prevent inflation. Here is an opponent of so many guises that it is sometimes difficult to recognize. But our clear need is to stop continuous and general price rises—a need that all of us can see and feel.

To prevent steadily rising costs and prices calls for stern self-discipline by every citizen. No person, city, State, or organized group can afford to evade the obligation to resist inflation, for every single American pays its crippling tax.

Inflation's ravages do not end at the water's edge. Increases in prices of the goods we sell abroad threaten to drive us out of markets that once were securely ours. Whether domestic prices, so high as to be noncompetitive, result from demands for too-high profit margins or from increased labor costs that outrun growth in productivity, the final result is seriously damaging to the Nation.

We must fight inflation as we would a fire that

imperils our home. Only by so doing can we prevent it from destroying our salaries, savings, pensions, and insurance, and from gnawing away the very roots of a free, healthy economy and the Nation's security.

One major method by which the Federal Government can counter inflation and rising prices is to insure that its expenditures are below its revenues. The debt with which we are now confronted is about \$290 billion. With interest charges alone now costing taxpayers about \$9½ billion, it is clear that this debt growth must stop. You will be glad to know that despite the unsettling influences of the recent steel strike, we estimate that our accounts will show, on June 30, this year, a favorable balance of approximately \$200 million.

I shall present to the Congress for 1961 a balanced budget. In the area of defense, expenditures continue at the record peacetime levels of the last several years. With a single exception, expenditures in every major category of health, education, and welfare will be equal or greater than last year. In space expenditures the amounts are practically doubled. But the overall guiding goal of this budget is national need—not response to specific group, local or political insistence.

Expenditure increases, other than those I have indicated, are largely accounted for by the increased cost of legislation previously enacted. I repeat, this budget will be a balanced one. Expenditures will be \$79,800 million. The amount of income over outgo described in the budget as a surplus to be applied against our national debt is \$4,200 million.

Personally, I do not feel that any amount can be properly called a surplus as long as the Nation is in debt; I prefer to think of such an item as a reduction of our children's inherited mortgage. And once we have established such payments as normal practices we can profitably make improvements in our tax structure and thereby truly reduce the heavy burdens of taxation. In any event this one reduction will save taxpayers each year approximately \$200 million in interest costs.

This favorable balance will help ease pressures in our credit and capital markets. It will enhance the confidence of people all over the world in the strength of our economy and our currency

and in our individual and collective ability to be fiscally responsible.

In the management of the huge public debt the Treasury is unfortunately not free of artificial barriers. Its ability to deal with the difficult problems in this field has been weakened greatly by the unwillingness of the Congress to remove archaic restrictions. The need for a freer hand in debt management is even more urgent today because the costs of the undesirable financing practices which the Treasury has been forced into are mounting. Removal of this roadblock has high priority in my legislative recommendations.

Still another issue relates to civil rights measures.

In all our hopes and plans for a better world we all recognize that provincial and racial prejudices must be combatted. In the long perspective of history, the right to vote has been one of the strongest pillars of a free society. Our first duty is to protect this right against all encroachment. In spite of constitutional guarantees, and notwithstanding much progress of recent years, bias still deprives some persons in this country of equal protection of the laws.

Early in your last session I recommended legislation which would help eliminate several practices discriminating against the basic rights of Americans. The Civil Rights Commission has developed additional constructive recommendations. I hope that these will be among the matters to be seriously considered in the current session. I trust that Congress will thus signal to the world that our Government is striving for equality under law for all our people.

Each year and in many ways our Nation continues to undergo profound change and growth.

In the past 18 months we have hailed the entry of two more States of the Union—Alaska and Hawaii. We salute these two western stars.

Our vigorous expansion, which we all welcome as a sign of health and vitality, is many-sided. We are, for example, witnessing explosive growth in metropolitan areas.

By 1975 the metropolitan areas of the United States will occupy twice the territory they do today. The roster of urban problems with which they must cope is staggering. They involve water supply, cleaning the air, adjusting local tax systems, providing for essential educational, cultural, and social services, and destroying those conditions which breed delinquency and crime.

In meeting these, we must, if we value our historic freedoms, keep within the traditional framework of our Federal system with powers divided between the National and State Governments. The uniqueness of this system may confound the casual observer, but it has worked effectively for nearly 200 years.

I do not doubt that our urban and other perplexing problems can be solved in the traditional American method. In doing so we must realize that nothing is really solved, indeed ruinous tendencies are set in motion by yielding to the deceptive bait of the "easy" Federal tax dollar.

Our educational system provides a ready example. All recognize the vital necessity of having modern school plants, well-qualified and adequately compensated teachers, and of using the best possible teaching techniques and curriculums.

We cannot be complacent about educating our youth. But the route to better trained minds is not through the swift administration of a Federal hypodermic or sustained financial transfusion. The educational process, essentially a local and personal responsibility, cannot be made to leap ahead by crash, centralized governmental action.

The administration has proposed a carefully reasoned program for helping eliminate current deficiencies. It is designed to stimulate classroom construction, not by substitution of Federal dollars for State and local funds, but by incentives to extend and encourage State and local efforts. This approach rejects the notion of Federal domination or control. It is workable, and should appeal to every American interested in advancement of our educational system in the traditional American way. I urge the Congress to take action upon it.

There is one other subject concerning which I renew a recommendation I made in my state of the Union message last January.⁷ I then advised the Congress of my purpose to intensify our efforts to replace force with a rule of law among nations. From many discussions abroad, I am convinced that purpose is widely and deeply shared by other peoples and nations of the world.

In the same message I stated that our efforts would include a reexamination of our own relation to the International Court of Justice. The Court was established by the United Nations to decide

⁷ *Ibid.*, Jan. 26, 1959, p. 115.

international legal disputes between nations. In 1946 we accepted the Court's jurisdiction, but subject to a reservation of the right to determine unilaterally whether a matter lies essentially within domestic jurisdiction. There is pending before the Senate a resolution which would repeal our present self-judging reservation.⁸ I support that resolution and urge its prompt passage. If this is done, I intend to urge similar acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction by every member of the United Nations.

Here perhaps it is not amiss for me to say a personal word to the Members of the Congress, in this my final year of office, a word about the institutions we respectively represent and the meaning which the relationships between our two branches has for the days ahead.

I am not unique as a President in having worked with a Congress controlled by the opposition party—except that no other President ever did it for quite so long. Yet in both personal and official relationships we have weathered the storms of the past 5 years. For this I am deeply grateful.

My deep concern in the next 12 months, before my successor takes office, is with our joint congressional-executive duty to our own and to other nations. Acting upon the beliefs I have expressed here today, I shall devote my full energies to the tasks at hand, whether these involve travel for promoting greater world understanding, negotiations to reduce international discord, or constant discussions and communications with the Congress and the American people on issues both domestic and foreign.

In pursuit of these objectives, I look forward to, and shall dedicate myself to, a close and constructive association with the Congress.

Every minute spent in irrelevant interbranch wrangling is precious time taken from the intelligent initiation and adoption of coherent policies for our national survival and progress.

We seek a common goal—brighter opportunity for our own citizens and a world peace with justice for all.

Before us and our friends is the challenge of an ideology which, for more than four decades, has trumpeted abroad its purpose of gaining ultimate victory over all forms of government at variance with its own.

⁸ For background, see p. 128.

We realize that however much we repudiate the tenets of imperialistic communism, it represents a gigantic enterprise. Its leaders compel its subjects to subordinate their freedom of action and spirit and personal desires for some hoped-for advantage in the future.

The Communists can present an array of material accomplishments over the past 15 years that lends a false persuasiveness to many of their glittering promises to the uncommitted peoples.

The competition they provide is formidable. We so recognize it.

But in our scale of values we place freedom first. Our whole national existence and development have been geared to that basic concept and is responsible for the position of free-world leadership to which we have succeeded. It is the highest prize that any nation can possess; it is one that communism can never offer. And America's record of material accomplishment in freedom is written not only in the unparalleled prosperity of our own Nation, but in the many billions we have devoted to the reconstruction of free-world economies wrecked by World War II and in the effective help of many more billions we have given in saving the independence of many others threatened by outside domination. Assuredly we have the capacity for handling the problems in the new era of the world's history we are now entering.

But we must use that capacity intelligently and tirelessly, regardless of personal sacrifice.

The fissure that divides our political planet is deep and wide.

We live, moreover, in a storm of semantic disorder in which old labels no longer faithfully describe.

Police states are called "people's democracies."

Armed conquest of free people is called "liberation."

Such slippery slogans make difficult the problem of communicating true faith, facts, and beliefs.

We must make clear our peaceful intentions, our aspirations for a better world. To do so, we must use language to enlighten the mind, not as the instrument of the studied innuendo and distorter of truth.

And we must live by what we say.

On my recent visit to distant lands I found one statesman after another eager to tell me of

the elements of their government that had been borrowed from our American Constitution, and from the indestructible ideals set forth in our Declaration of Independence.

As a nation we take pride that our own constitutional system, and the ideals which sustain it have been long viewed as a fountainhead of freedom.

By our every word and action we must strive to make ourselves worthy of this trust, ever mindful that an accumulation of seemingly minor encroachments upon freedom gradually could break down the entire fabric of a free society.

So persuaded, we shall get on with the task before us.

So dedicated, and with faith in the Almighty, humanity shall one day achieve the unity in freedom to which all men have aspired from the dawn of time.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 7, 1960.

President Eisenhower To Visit South America

White House Statement

White House press release dated January 6

The President, accompanied by Mrs. Eisenhower, plans to visit Brazil, February 23-26; Argentina, February 26-29; Chile, February 29-March 2; and Uruguay, March 2-3; with brief stops in Puerto Rico.

The President, in visiting the four southernmost countries of our neighboring continent, is partially fulfilling his long-held desire personally to travel in South America, to meet the people, and to renew friendships with the leaders of the nations so closely allied with the United States in the Organization of American States. The President hopes that his visit will serve two purposes:

Publicly reflect his deep interest in all the countries of the New World, and

Encourage further development of the inter-American system, not only as a means of meeting the aspirations of the peoples of the Americas but also as a further example of the way all peoples may live in peaceful cooperation.

January 25, 1960

United States and Soviet Union Exchange New Year Greetings

White House (Augusta, Ga.) press release dated January 4

The White House on January 4 made public the following exchange of messages between the President and Nikita S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers, and Kliment Efremovich Voroshilov, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The President to Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Voroshilov

JANUARY 2, 1960

On behalf of the American people, I thank you for your kind New Year's message. I share the hope which you have expressed for a further improvement in the relations between our two countries. The United States seeks the achievement of a just and lasting peace in a world where all questions are settled by peaceful means alone. I can assure you that my Government will continue its best efforts to reach that goal. Please accept my good wishes for you and your families and the people of the Soviet Union for the coming year.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Voroshilov to the President

DECEMBER 31, 1959

On the eve of the New Year we send to you, Mr. President, and to the people of the United States of America sincere greetings and best wishes from the peoples of the Soviet Union and from ourselves personally. It is possible to note with deep satisfaction that in the past year there were undertaken joint efforts in the search of ways for closer relations of our States, for ensurance of such a situation in which the unresolved international questions would be decided by peaceful means only. Entering the New Year, we would like to hope sincerely that these joint efforts will guarantee a new triumph of reason, and that a start will be made to solve the most important problem of our times—the general and complete disarmament and the liberation of mankind from the burden of armament.

Let this New Year be the year of a further improvement in the relations between our countries. The realization of this hope which is so dear to the hearts of both the Soviet and American peoples would undoubtedly bring nearer the time when, thanks to the efforts of both countries, the relations between them could be built on the foundation of enduring friendship and mutually advantageous cooperation for the good of our nations, for the

good of peace in the entire world. It is exactly in this way that we evaluate the meaning of exchange visits by the leading statesmen of both countries. These meetings make it possible to ensure that historical turning point in the relations between our countries, as well as in the international situation as a whole, which leads to the deliverance of all people from the dread of a new war.

With best wishes for happiness and health to you personally and to your entire family.

N. KHRUSHCHEV
K. VOROSHILOV

United States and Netherlands Hold Civil Aviation Consultation

Press release 3 dated January 6

The following statement was issued jointly by the Department of State and the Netherlands Embassy at Washington on January 6.

A civil aviation consultation between representatives of the Governments of the United States and the Netherlands will begin in Washington on January 7 to consider the request of the Netherlands Government for a route authorizing air services between the Netherlands and Los Angeles. The request for the consultation was made several months ago by the Netherlands Government.

Under the existing Air Transport Services Agreement of April 1957,¹ KLM Royal Dutch Airlines operates on separate routes to New York and Houston from the Netherlands and to Miami and New York from the Netherlands Antilles. United States airlines are authorized to operate to Amsterdam, Surinam, the Netherlands Antilles and beyond to points in third countries.

The Netherlands Delegation is headed by Mr. E. G. Stijkel, State Secretary for Transport and Waterways. Other members of the Delegation are: Mr. H. J. Spanjaard, Director of Civil Aviation, Ministry of Transport and Waterways; Dr. J. C. Kruisheer, Economic Minister, Netherlands Embassy; Mr. J. C. Nieuwenhuysen, Deputy Transportation Adviser, Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Mr. F. J. H. Barend, Representative of the Government of Surinam; Mr. E. D. Baiz, Repre-

sentative of the Government of the Netherlands Antilles; Dr. L. H. Slotemaker, Executive Vice President, KLM Royal Dutch Airlines; Mr. M. Mourik, Second Commercial Secretary, Netherlands Embassy.

The United States Delegation is headed by Mr. Laurence C. Vass, Director, Office of Transport and Communications, Department of State. Other members of the Delegation are: Mr. G. Joseph Minetti, Member, Civil Aeronautics Board; Mr. Bradley D. Nash, Deputy Under Secretary for Transportation, Department of Commerce; Mr. Theodore Hardeen, Jr., Administrator, Defense Air Transportation Administration, Department of Commerce (Alternate); Mr. Joseph C. Watson, Associate Director, Bureau of Air Operations, Civil Aeronautics Board; Mr. James C. Haahr, Chief, Air Transport Relations, Aviation Division, Department of State; Mr. Robert M. Beaudry, Economic Officer, Swiss-Benelux Affairs, Office of Western European Affairs, Department of State; Mr. William Klima, International Division, Civil Aeronautics Board; Mr. Paul Reiber, Air Transport Association (Observer).

President de Gaulle To Visit U.S.

White House press release dated January 6

The White House announced on January 6 that the President of the Republic of France, General Charles de Gaulle, will pay a state visit to the United States during the spring. It is planned that President de Gaulle will arrive at Washington from Canada on April 22 and remain there until April 25. Thereafter, he will spend a day in New York City and will complete his visit by spending approximately 3 days in other cities in the United States. The exact itinerary has not yet been developed.

President Eisenhower is particularly pleased that he will have the opportunity of receiving President de Gaulle in Washington not only to renew his friendship with his comrade-in-arms and friend but also to have the occasion officially of receiving the Chief of State of the nation which is the oldest ally and friend of our country.

¹ For text, see BULLETIN of May 6, 1957, p. 747.

Ca
has
ness
own
O
some
tion
coop
seur
othe
mod
tion
that
W
with
freed
give
the c
ing k
I s
ter c
to m
these
in ki
1 Ad
Montr
Janu

Canadian-United States Cooperation for Peace

by Richard B. Wigglesworth
Ambassador to Canada¹

Il me fait un grand plaisir d'être ici aujourd'hui, et je vous remercie de votre aimable invitation. Je suis très heureux d'être à Montréal et d'avoir le privilège de rencontrer les membres de votre Club et leurs amis.

J'ai eu l'occasion pendant les derniers mois de voyager quelques 25,000 milles en terre canadienne d'un océan à l'autre, de rencontrer un grand nombre de vos concitoyens et de me familiariser avec vos traditions, vos aspirations, et vos convictions.

What I have learned from my travels in Canada has impelled me inevitably to reflect on the closeness between Canadian aims and the aims of my own country.

Our relationship prompts me to discuss today some aspects of Canadian-United States cooperation for peace. I do so because the nature of this cooperation is, I think, often obscured. It is obscured on the one hand by platitudes and on the other by the very complexities of security in the modern world. The result is a lack of appreciation of its unique character and the circumstances that brought it about.

Were I an historian I probably would start with the Rush-Bagot agreement of 1818, which freed our Great Lakes of warships. And I would give considerable attention to World War I and the contribution our two countries made to turning back that onslaught against our security.

I shall limit myself, however, to the last quarter of a century. I shall do so because it seems to me that our joint response to the dangers of these years has been different both in degree and in kind from the alliances and pacts that we find

as a general rule in the history of international relations.

The old saying that "the enemy of my enemy is my friend" is of course totally inadequate to describe the depth and strength that characterize our cooperation. I am not concerned with the superficial similarities or differences that one may find between us and between our countries. I speak of something more profound. I would like to outline the cooperation between our countries during the past 25 years and to emphasize its significance to the security of the free world.

Response to Fascism

Fascism, the first of the two great challenges of the past 25 years, took the form of military aggression.

Though the Fascists used the tools of propaganda and the "big lie" with a thoroughness never before witnessed, our danger was a familiar one. We were faced, for the most part, with a classic war of men, maneuver, and materiel. No matter how hard or how costly the effort required of us, we understood immediately the kind of response the threat dictated. Only by war could fascism take our freedom.

We shared an enemy, and we shared a continent. That alone was enough to insure unity of action. We also shared the raw materials and the industrial capacity with which to build the complex machinery of modern war. And we sensed that if we did not put these resources together to a degree never before known in international affairs, our efforts might be not only inefficient but not enough.

Our joint action was possible only because we

¹ Address made before the Montreal Canadian Club, Montreal, Canada, on Dec. 14.

had shared many years of mutual respect and good faith as well. Anyone who looked for pillboxes along our common border would have known that.

The conviction that North America is more than a geographic concept did not grow overnight. Throughout the thirties, as foreign places many of our people had never heard of—Manchuria, Ethiopia, the Sudetenland, Danzig—took over the front pages of our newspapers, the idea slowly and spontaneously spread.

I think particularly of President Roosevelt's address at Chautauqua, New York, on August 14, 1936:

Our closest neighbors are good neighbors. If there are remoter nations that wish us not good but ill, they know that we are strong; they know that we can and will defend ourselves and defend our neighborhood.

Or the President's words at Kingston, Ontario, on August 18, 1938:

I give to you assurance that the people of the United States will not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil is threatened by any other empire.

I also think of an address by Prime Minister Mackenzie King at Woodbridge, Ontario, on August 20, 1938:

We too have our obligations as a good friendly neighbor, and one of these is to see that, at our own instance, our country is made as immune from attack or possible invasion as we can reasonably be expected to make it, and that, should the occasion ever arise, enemy forces should not be able to pursue their way either by land, sea or air, to the United States across Canadian territory.

This growing awareness of our common danger and our common responsibilities led to our first great joint decision. I quote from the Ogdensburg agreement of August 18, 1940:²

The Prime Minister and the President have discussed the mutual problems of defense in relation to the safety of Canada and the United States.

It has been agreed that a Permanent Joint Board on Defense shall be set up at once by the two countries.

This Permanent Joint Board on Defense shall commence immediate studies relating to sea, land, and air problems including personnel and matériel.

It will consider in the broad sense the defense of the north half of the Western Hemisphere.

This Permanent Joint Board was from the beginning an unqualified success. As you know, it still contributes greatly to the cooperation between

our two countries in respect to the defense of the North American Continent.

The second great step in this period of our common efforts, the Hyde Park declaration of April 20, 1941,³ was in a sense even more far reaching than the decision at Ogdensburg. I quote from it here because it illustrates the degree of cooperation which we were to attain:

Among other important matters, the President and the Prime Minister discussed measures by which the most prompt and effective utilization might be made of the productive facilities of North America for the purposes both of local and hemisphere defense and of the assistance which in addition to their own programs both Canada and the United States are rendering to Great Britain and the other democracies.

It was agreed as a general principle that in mobilizing the resources of this continent each country should provide the other with the defense articles which it is best able to produce, and, above all, produce quickly, and that production programs should be coordinated to this end.

It would serve no useful purpose to discuss World War II in any detail today. Many of you were in that war and remember well the first desperate years, then the great sweeps of the Allied armies, the ever-increasing flow of men and matériel, the billions in aid to our Allies from our two countries, and the victories that followed.

It is possible that some of you were among those Canadians who received parachute training at Fort Benning, Georgia. Or perhaps you were in Manitoba teaching United States soldiers the techniques of fighting in cold weather. Perhaps you flew fighter cover for our Flying Fortresses, or it may be that as you moved north in Italy you had close air support from United States airmen.

And I would remind you that when Pearl Harbor was attacked there were more than 16,000 United States citizens in Canadian uniform. And, strange as it may seem, by the time the United States had declared war on Japan, Canada had already done so.

The Ogdensburg agreement acknowledged our responsibilities to each other. As we disbanded our armies after the war and reconverted our factories to peacetime production we recognized new responsibilities. Our world grew smaller; our obligations grew greater. Our vigorous adherence to the charter of the United Nations is proof of our acceptance of these new responsibilities and of our allegiance to free men everywhere.

² For text, see BULLETIN of Aug. 24, 1940, p. 154.

³ For text, see *ibid.*, Apr. 26, 1941, p. 494.

Military Response to Communist Imperialism

The second great danger of our time—international communism—became a reality in the years after the war. One aspect only of this new threat to the free world was military, but that aspect had to be faced first. We could not build for a world of free men without insuring that men would be free.

Our two Governments decided that it would be unwise to destroy the coordination we had so carefully built, but they recognized that this coordination had a wider frame of reference. I quote from a joint statement of February 12, 1947,⁴ released simultaneously in Ottawa and Washington:

In the interest of efficiency and economy, each Government has decided that its national defense establishment shall, to the extent authorized by law, continue to collaborate for peacetime joint security purposes. . . .

It has been the task of the Governments to assure that the close security relationship between Canada and the United States in North America will in no way impair but on the contrary will strengthen the cooperation of each country within the broader framework of the United Nations.

I do not recall that this statement received very much attention at the time. After all, the deadliest war in history was barely over. The world had surely learned, at least for a time, the disastrous consequences of aggression.

But it was an uneasy time. For example, why would an ally, presumably grateful for Canadian assistance, operate a spy ring in Canada? Was the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia really a domestic issue of no consequence to the rest of the world? Were the outlaws who sought to overrun the mainland of China really only peaceful agrarian reformers?

Then came the Berlin blockade.

Even the most wishful thinkers were forced to concede that the free world was faced again with possible disaster. The new threat demanded a whole series of new responses. In the military sphere they followed one another in quick sequence.

To counter the threat of armed aggression in Europe, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was born. To counter the Communist invasion of south Korea a United Nations military force was formed for the first time in history, to protect a nation from aggression.

It is unnecessary to dwell upon the Korean war. Our wounds are too fresh and our memories too full. But when we remember the cost in blood and treasure of that action, we must also remember its purpose and the result. More than 9 years after the invasion began, the Republic of Korea is still free.

The war also reinforced a lesson we had learned the hard way. The troops which invaded Manchuria fought on to Nanking, Singapore, and the Aleutians. The troops that marched into the Rhineland marched on to Paris, Athens, and Stalingrad. But the Communists who invaded south Korea have not fought their way to Australia or Japan, or to British Columbia or California.

We stood together, and under the flag of the United Nations we fought together. We were determined and united.

Surely others, too, learned a lesson from Korea. It is not likely that our determination to defend the free world will again be taken lightly.

But before this bitter war was over, North America itself faced the threat of aggression. The possibility of bombers from across the Arctic was no longer merely a classroom exercise in military theory.

Our joint response was the Pinetree Line, the Mid-Canada Line, the Distant Early Warning Line, and finally, on August 1, 1957, the announcement, already communicated to NATO, that Canada and the United States planned to operate their systems of air defense under an integrated joint command responsible to the Chiefs of Staff of both countries.⁵

We now know this command as NORAD—the North American Air Defense Command—and I regret that it is impossible for all the citizens of both our countries to visit its headquarters at Colorado Springs and its ever-ready fighting units across this continent and at sea. It is a splendid example of our cooperation at the service level.

To speak of NORAD today is to speak of a force of over 200,000 men, not to mention their equipment and augmentation forces. It is a compliment to the quiet efficiency of NORAD under the leadership of our General [Laurence S.] Kuter and your Air Marshal [Charles R.] Slemmon that so many of us take it for granted.

⁴ For text, see *ibid.*, Feb. 23, 1947, p. 361.

⁵ For text of joint statement, see *ibid.*, Aug. 19, 1957, p. 306.

What air defense did we have 10 years ago? One radar squadron and two gun battalions, according to General Kuter. A far cry from the radar, supersonic interceptors, the surface-to-air missiles, and the electronic computers that guard us today.

We hope the effectiveness of NORAD is never tested in battle. We shall never know to what degree its strength has already deterred the ambitions of those who might otherwise have been tempted to try to destroy us.

But jet aircraft and the BOMARC are no match for intercontinental ballistic missiles. Nor are they supposed to be. Will NORAD, then, as some say, soon outlive its usefulness?

I am not a military expert; so I will let an expert speak for me. General Kuter addressed the NATO Parliamentarians Conference in Washington a few weeks ago. I quote:

Let me say here that we believe that the manned bomber will be a serious threat for a long time to come.

We are told that the missile will ultimately become the primary threat, but even so it will be a mixed threat, and the bomber will still be used against pinpoint or hardened targets, for mopup operations, or for a variety of situations which demand human intelligence and judgment on the spot.

We are also convinced that the subsonic attack—on the deck—at very low altitude—will remain a threat indefinitely.

But when the day does come that intercontinental missiles are the primary threat, will NORAD be helpless to deal with them? What is being done to insure that we can defend ourselves and strike back? I quote once more from General Kuter's address:

Another major area in which we are now working is that of defense against missiles.

We are installing now in the far north a missile warning system entitled the "Ballistic Missile Early Warning System"—short title, BMEWS.

These are enormous fan-beam radars which will give us not only warnings but an approximate idea of a missile impact area.

We are working vigorously in perfecting an antimissile missile. . . . And we have every confidence that free-world scientific and military capability is more than a match for anything communism may throw at us.

That is why we believe that when the missile becomes an operational threat in significant numbers we will have a system to counteract it. The stakes are too high to fail now.

Speaking also at the same NATO Parliamentarians Conference Admiral [Jerauld] Wright,

the NATO Atlantic commander,⁶ emphasized the vital importance of the military task which confronts us today as partners and allies. He stressed the fact that there are three basic defense tasks which must be accomplished by NATO:

1. the defense of Europe;
2. the defense of North America;
3. the defense of the Atlantic.

No one of these, he said, can be defended in isolation:

Europe could not be defended without the retaliatory capability and the logistic and military reinforcement capacity of North America.

The defense of North America would be made immeasurably more difficult if Europe should fall.

And neither could be defended if we lost control of our trans-Atlantic lines of sea communication between the two.

"Our basic and fundamental military task," he added, "is the *prevention* of war by our *strength*: strength to retaliate and strength to defend."

Before I end my discussion of our responses to the military threat posed by international communism, I should like to say a few words about one of the means of our defense that weighs heavily on us all—nuclear weapons. I think it might be useful to begin with an examination of the circumstances that require our possession of these weapons.

Shortly after their meeting in Paris in December 1957, the NATO Heads of Government issued a communique, from which I quote:⁷

The Soviet leaders, while preventing a general disarmament agreement, have made it clear that the most modern and destructive weapons, including missiles of all kinds, are being introduced in the Soviet armed forces. In the Soviet view, all European nations except the U.S.S.R. should, without waiting for general disarmament, renounce nuclear weapons and missiles and rely on arms of the pre-atomic age.

As long as the Soviet Union persists in this attitude, we have no alternative but to remain vigilant and to look to our defenses. We are therefore resolved to achieve the most effective pattern of NATO military defensive strength, taking into account the most recent developments in weapons and techniques.

At that meeting the Heads of Government

⁶ For an announcement of the designation of Adm. Robert L. Dennison to succeed Admiral Wright as Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic, see *ibid.*, Jan. 11, 1960, p. 45.

⁷ For text, see *ibid.*, Jan. 6, 1958, p. 12.

agreed that the overwhelming numerical superiority of the Soviet armed forces—better than 80 Russian divisions directly facing Western Europe—required that the NATO shield forces have a nuclear capability.

Accordingly a series of agreements was concluded under the terms of which weapons capable of carrying nuclear warheads were made available to certain NATO countries. The warheads, which would be used only to meet aggression, remained in the custody of the United States. When the North Atlantic Council announced the conclusion of these agreements on May 7, 1959,⁸ it specifically quoted from the North Atlantic Council's communique of May 3 two years before.⁹ I quote:

Pending an acceptable agreement on disarmament, no power can claim the right to deny to the Alliance the possession of the modern arms needed for its defence. If, however, the fears professed by the Soviet Union are sincere, they could be readily dissipated. All that is needed is for the Soviet Union to accept a general disarmament agreement embodying effective measures of control and inspection within the framework of the proposals made on numerous occasions by the Western Powers, which remain an essential basis of their policy.

The Communists have tried to convince us that should we disarm unilaterally there would be no tension between them and the free world. They are right; there would be no free world.

It is clear, I think, no matter how profound our regret, that we must maintain a nuclear deterrent until a nuclear deterrent is no longer required. We have no choice. Thus, to give NATO's defense posture both breadth and flexibility, it was necessary to arm our shield forces with nuclear-capable weapons.

Nevertheless, in so arming our forces, it was also necessary to observe our obligation to reason and to humanity, to inhibit any increase in the number of holders of the warheads themselves. This obligation is embodied in an act of the United States Congress.¹⁰ I do not think any reasonable man underestimates the danger this law sought to minimize.

How much greater the danger under which we live would become if 10 or 50 nations had nuclear weapons for use as they chose. To have them

ready for defensive use and to insure that their use will be for defense only presents a dilemma we can ignore only at our peril. I submit that the solution we have found for our dilemma is a wise one. The free world has the necessary military strength today.

Speaking in this connection about a year ago President Eisenhower stated,¹¹ "As of today [we have the necessary power to] present to any potential attacker who would unleash war upon the world the prospect of virtual annihilation of his country." And he added, "Every informed government knows this. It is no secret." This military strength has preserved the peace of the world in recent years.

It is of course our deepest wish that all nations may disarm, but disarmament is not a one-way street. It is possible only in the event of effective international inspection and control. While there is a mailed fist anywhere, the free world must continue to bear the necessary armor. If we have it, we may not need it. If we need it and do not have it, we shall never need it again.

Economic Cooperation for Peace

I have emphasized the vital importance of Canadian-United States cooperation to the defense of the free world. I believe, however, I would leave an unbalanced picture if I did not at least briefly touch on a no less vital element in maintaining peace. That element is free-world economic cooperation.

Military strength alone will not achieve our objectives. Much more is required to end the cold war and to build the international understanding and confidence essential to world peace.

Millions of people in Asia and Africa are today struggling to throw off the yoke of poverty and misery under which they have existed so long. Some of them are determined to attain a better standard of living, cost what it may—even, if necessary, at the expense of freedom.

If freedom, security, and world peace are to be realized, the reasonable aspirations of these people must be furthered. The offensive must be maintained against hunger, disease, and privation.

The United States, Canada, and the free world took the initiative in this field long before the Communists had ever thought of a foreign aid

⁸ *Ibid.*, May 25, 1959, p. 739.

⁹ For text, see *ibid.*, May 27, 1957, p. 840.

¹⁰ Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

¹¹ BULLETIN of Jan. 27, 1958, p. 115.

program. We are fighting these ancient miseries which offer such fertile ground for communism's favorite technique of political subversion and economic penetration.

Aid alone will not bring the victory over poverty and hunger. People must have within their own hands the means of self-support in dignity and freedom. This can be assured only if the world's trade is founded on principles which promote expansion and provide opportunity. Canada and the United States have led the world toward these principles ever since the end of World War II.

The freedom preserved through defensive strength must not be lost to ignorance and hunger. Yes, we have guns for the defense of the free world, but we also have engineers, technicians, and surgeons, and food, and the certainty that all men wish to be free. And we are determined through understanding and cooperation to build lasting confidence and friendship which are so vital in this troubled world.

The Future

We have come a long way since the agreement at Ogdensburg. The world has changed and with it our responsibilities have changed—our responsibilities to ourselves and to all those who respect the charter of the United Nations.

But some things have not changed. When I mentioned a few minutes ago some of the things we share, my list was incomplete. I left out perhaps the most important things of all: the belief that peace and freedom are possible for all men and the hope that the door to peace and freedom may be opened as a result of our strength in cooperation.

My travels and observations during the past year have served to underline for me the great contribution which the cooperation between our two nations has made to the peace and security of the free world. They have also served to underline the vital importance of our continued cooperation for peace in the period which lies ahead.

May I add that what we have done for ourselves we have done for all free men. And what we have done for the security of the free world we have done for ourselves.

There is still much to do. Perhaps there always will be. But I am sure we will do it together. If we do not, it will not be done at all.

To paraphrase the words of your distinguished Prime Minister [John George Diefenbaker] at ceremonies in Prince Albert which I was privileged to attend: The price of peace is cooperation and the prize of cooperation is peace.

IJC Reports on Development of Columbia River Basin

Press release 885 dated December 30

The Department of State announced on December 30 that the International Joint Commission has submitted to the Governments of the United States and Canada its report on "principles for determining and apportioning benefits from cooperative use of storage of waters and electrical interconnection within the Columbia River system." The report was made public on December 30 at Washington and Ottawa.

In January 1959 the two Governments requested the Commission to make a special report on the determination and allocation of benefits which might result from the cooperative development of the Columbia River system with particular regard to electrical generation and flood control.¹

In receiving the report the Department of State expressed appreciation for the constructive efforts of the members of the International Joint Commission and the fact that the Commission was able to reach agreement on its recommendations. The Acting Chairman of the U.S. Section is Eugene W. Weber, and the Chairman of the Canadian Section is Gen. A.G.L. McNaughton. The other Canadian Commissioners are Donald L. Stephens of Winnipeg and Lucien Dansereau of Montreal. The other U.S. Commissioner is Francis Adams. The Department of State recalled the contribution which the late Gov. Douglas McKay made to the Commission's work as Chairman of the U.S. Section.

The Commission's report is now under study by appropriate officials in the U.S. and Canadian Governments with a view to its usefulness as guidelines in negotiation of an agreement covering specific projects and cooperative arrangements in the Columbia River Basin. After consultation with the appropriate congressional committees the Department of State will consult further

¹ BULLETIN of Feb. 16, 1959, p. 243.

with
Affa
neg
A
ousl

U.S.
Con

For
rele
clusi
Mea

Press

In
traff
worl
Mexi
invi
the G
met i
1960,
intens
in na
nation
the tw
paign
intern
tional
tries
United
It was
unders
the fr
two G
best ef
bat me
additio
intern
Govern

In t
Delega
pared
sonnel
equipm
desire.

On t
viction
to enco

January

with the Canadian Department of External Affairs concerning the commencement of treaty negotiations.

A similar announcement was made simultaneously at Ottawa.

U.S. and Mexican Officials Discuss Control of Illegal Drug Traffic

Following is the text of a joint communique released at Washington on January 5 at the conclusion of a 2-day meeting of delegations from Mexico and the United States.

Press release 2 dated January 5 (revised)

In view of the fact that illicit production, traffic and use of narcotic drugs constitutes a world problem as well as a problem which affects Mexico and the United States alike and upon the invitations of the United States, delegations of the Governments of the United States and Mexico met in Washington, D.C., on January 4 and 5, 1960, to explore, informally, ways and means of intensifying the campaign against illicit traffic in narcotics in accordance with existing international treaties and the domestic legislation of the two countries. It was agreed that this campaign offers a most fruitful opportunity for international cooperation as is explicit in international treaties on narcotics to which both countries are parties and in their membership in the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs. It was also agreed that, in the spirit of mutual understanding and respect which characterizes the friendly relations of the two countries, the two Governments would continue to make their best efforts to find appropriate measures to combat more effectively the traffic in illegal drugs, in addition to the implementation of provisions of international treaties on the subject that each Government is observing to the best of its ability.

In this connection the Chief of the American Delegation stated that his Government is prepared to offer its facilities in the training of personnel and the use of scientific and technical equipment, if the Mexican Government should so desire.

On this basis each delegation stated their conviction that their Governments would continue to encourage closer cooperation between Federal,

State and municipal officials of the two countries who are engaged in the fight against the nefarious activities of narcotic criminals in the two countries. It was noted that the general public is frequently unaware of the operations of competent authorities in the narcotics field because of the necessarily confidential nature of enforcement methods.

There was complete recognition that the drug traffic between the two countries involves the illicit production, distribution or transit of narcotic drugs in Mexico and the illegal sale and use of or addiction to those drugs in the United States. In this connection the Chief of the Mexican Delegation called attention to the fact that since 1947 a national campaign has been carried out in Mexico with the cooperation of all levels of government to combat the illicit cultivation, traffic or transportation of narcotic drugs. The Chief of the American Delegation commented that the United States has increased the number of customs and narcotics agents in the areas near the border and is prepared to enter into a cooperative training program for the enforcement agents of both countries.

The members of both Delegations stressed the need for continuous public enlightenment regarding the seriousness of the drug problem, especially in areas of widespread addiction, and the importance of wholehearted support of the people in supporting such measures as have a reasonable likelihood of eliminating the violators of narcotics laws—the perpetrators of the most abominable crime against the health and welfare of our communities.

Mexican Delegation:

Lic. Oscar Rabasa, Chief of Delegation, Director in Chief for American Affairs and the Foreign Service, Ministry for Foreign Relations, and Permanent Representative of Mexico to the United Nations Commission on Narcotics

Lic. Juan Barona Lobato, Assistant to the Attorney General of Mexico

Lic. Santiago Ibañez Llamas, Chief Inspector of Immigration, Ministry of the Interior

Lic. Francisco Alfaro S., Chief of Legal Department, Ministry of Health and Assistance

Lic. José Luis Laris, Secretary to Delegation, First Secretary of Embassy, Mexican Embassy, Washington, D.C.

United States Delegation:

Myles Ambrose, Chief of Delegation, Assistant to the Secretary for Law Enforcement, Department of the Treasury

Chester A. Emerick, Deputy Commissioner of Customs, Investigations, Department of the Treasury
 Henry L. Giordano, Deputy Commissioner of Narcotics, Department of the Treasury
 John S. Hoghland, 2d, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, Department of State
 Robert F. Hale, Consul General, American Consulate General, Tijuana, Mexico
 Melville E. Osborne, Officer in Charge, Mexican Affairs, Department of State
 Elwyn F. Chase, Jr., Office of International Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State

U.S. Congressmen James Roosevelt and Joe Holt from the State of California attended and participated in the discussions held in Washington.

THE CONGRESS

President Expresses Views on World Court and Disarmament

Following is an exchange of letters between President Eisenhower and Senator Hubert H. Humphrey which was made public by Senator Humphrey on November 27.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO SENATOR HUMPHREY

AUGUSTA, GEORGIA
 November 17, 1959

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I write now in further reply to your letter of October 21, 1959.

One of the great purposes of this Administration has been to advance the rule of law in the world, through actions directly by the United States Government and in concert with the governments of other countries. It is open to us to further this great purpose both through optimum use of existing international institutions and through the adoption of changes and improvements in those institutions.

Timely consideration by the United Nations of threatening situations, in Egypt in 1956, in Lebanon in 1958, and in Laos in 1959, has made an important contribution to the preservation of

international peace and security. The continued development of mutual defense and security arrangements among the United States and a large number of free-world countries has provided a powerful deterrent against international law-breaking. One cannot, however, be satisfied with the way events have developed in some areas—for example, Hungary, and Tibet. The international community needs to find more effective means to cope with and to prevent such brutal uses of force.

One of the principal efforts of the United States in the last half dozen years has been to devise effective means for controlling and reducing armaments. Success in this quest will bring greater security to all countries and lift the threat of devastating nuclear conflict. In order to make progress toward the goal of complete and general disarmament expressed in the United Nations resolution¹ recently sponsored by the United States and the other members of the General Assembly, this Government has followed the policy of seeking reliable international agreements on manageable segments of the whole arms problem. I am hopeful that the current Geneva negotiations on discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests will produce agreement.² A resulting treaty would, of course, be submitted to the Senate.

Next year the United States will be participating in further disarmament efforts to be undertaken by a group of ten nations which will, as appropriate, report on its progress to the United Nations Disarmament Commission and General Assembly.³ The best and most carefully elaborated disarmament agreements are likely to carry with them some risks, at least theoretically, of evasion. But one must ponder, in reaching decisions on the very complex and difficult subject of arms control, the enormous risks entailed if reasonable steps are not taken to curb the international competition in armaments and to move effectively in the direction of disarmament.

As you know from my message to the Congress on the State of the Union in January 1959,⁴ and

¹ For text, see BULLETIN of Nov. 23, 1959, p. 766.

² For a statement by the chairman of the U.S. delegation, see *ibid.*, Jan. 18, 1960, p. 79.

³ For background, see *ibid.*, Jan. 11, 1960, p. 45.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Jan. 26, 1959, p. 115.

from expressions by the Vice President,⁵ the Secretary of State,⁶ and the Attorney General,⁷ the Administration is anxious to contribute to the greater effectiveness of the International Court of Justice. The Administration supports elimination of the automatic reservation to the Court's jurisdiction by which the United States has reserved to itself the right to determine unilaterally whether a subject of litigation lies essentially within domestic jurisdiction. I intend, therefore, on an appropriate occasion, to re-state to the Congress my support for the elimination of this reservation. Elimination of this automatic reservation from our own declaration accepting compulsory jurisdiction would place the United States in a better position to urge other countries to agree to wider jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

I appreciate having your views on this vitally important subject.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
United States Senate
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR HUMPHREY TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

OCTOBER 21, 1959

The PRESIDENT
The White House
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In your State of the Union Message on January 9, 1959, you declared it to be your purpose to intensify our efforts to the end that the rule of law may replace the obsolete rule of force in the affairs of nations. In particular, you advised the Congress to expect a more specific proposal from you, dealing with the problem of our relationship to the International Court of Justice. Subsequently, the Vice President and the Attorney General have delivered important addresses citing your concern with this problem.

Along with many other members of Congress in both parties, I was delighted to note this emphasis on a program of strengthening the Court. An American initiative

along this line would, I know, be welcome throughout the world.

In selecting for first attention the problem of the American relationship to the Court itself, you have I believe, made a wise judgment. In particular, the reservation to ourselves of the right to determine whether a case lies within our domestic jurisdiction, should be eliminated as soon as possible. Since reservations of any party automatically accrue to its adversary, this reservation probably will be used against our interests more frequently than it is used in our behalf.

I should like to say, Mr. President, that the initiatives you have taken toward the establishment of an international rule of law are most welcome. They have my wholehearted support, and, I am confident, the support of most members of the Congress.

Senate Resolution 94⁸ supports your position in this matter. The State Department has advised the Foreign Relations Committee that it is in agreement with this Resolution. There is considerable support among members of the Foreign Relations Committee for this step toward greater participation in the Court, but there is a general feeling, which I share, that since you have indicated a desire to speak further on this subject, final action should be held in abeyance pending your message.

I regret very much that the first session of the present Congress has adjourned without receiving your message on this important subject.

I respectfully urge you to give this further consideration. I hope that you will, either in your next State of the Union message or in a special communication, advise us of the broad policies which guide the United States Government in its efforts to establish a rule of law in the world, and also describe the specific measures which Congress should pass to aid in accomplishing this general purpose. Since Senate Resolution 94 is now widely understood and has been fully discussed in the press, and since the withdrawal of the self-judgement aspect of the domestic jurisdiction reservation is an obvious first step, I hope your message will contain a plea for the early passage of Senate Resolution 94.

The enunciation of general principles of long range foreign policy are most useful. The public acceptance of these broad principles will be bolstered by concrete proposals. It is with this in mind that I have introduced Senate Resolution 94, which is admittedly only a very small step toward the greater common goal which we share. With your support I am confident that the Senate will accept this measure, and we will then be able to look toward the further establishment of what our late Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, called "institutions of peace."

Advocacy of measures looking toward the establishment of a just and lasting peace has always been urgent. It is

⁸ S. Res. 94 calls for U.S. renunciations of the right to declare an international legal dispute as "essentially domestic" and for acceptance of World Court jurisdiction in such disputes regarding interpretation of treaties, any questions of international law, breaches of international obligation, and reparations.

⁵ *Ibid.*, May 4, 1959, p. 622.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Feb. 23, 1959, p. 255.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Sept. 14, 1959, p. 379.

particularly urgent now, after the recent visit of the Soviet Chairman, to make it doubly clear to the entire world that, while we shall strive mightily for a peaceful resolution of Soviet-U.S. differences, our goal has not shifted toward a two-power world; rather we continue to look resolutely toward an international system in which the rights of all nations will be respected, regardless of size or military power.

An American expression of confidence in the Court at this time, would be of tremendous value and I hope you will find an early occasion to express your personal support of legislation to make our American membership in the Court what it should be.

Respectfully yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Secretary Sends Report to Congress on East-West Center in Hawaii

Following is the text of a letter from Secretary Herter transmitting to the Congress a report on "A Plan for the Establishment in Hawaii of a Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West,"¹ together with the text of chapter 6, "Summary of Proposals and Estimates."

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

DECEMBER 31, 1959

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT:² I transmit herewith, pursuant to the provisions of Chapter VI of the Mutual Security Act of 1959, a Report describing a Plan and Program for the Establishment and Operation in Hawaii of a Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West.

The report presents both the role which such a Center could have in relations between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific and the problems and needs involved in its establishment. Attention is called especially to the problem of Federal assistance, as described on Pages 11 and 18.

It is not considered that funds available under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, may

¹ A limited number of copies of the report are available upon request from the Office of Public Services, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

² An identical letter, with a copy of the report, was sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

be used for construction and operating costs of the Center.

With warmest personal regards,
Most sincerely,

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

Enclosures: Report entitled "A Plan for the Establishment in Hawaii of a Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West", dated December 30, 1959.

THE VICE PRESIDENT
United States Senate.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS AND ESTIMATES

An International Center, as proposed, concentrating on Asian and Pacific affairs and established in connection with the University of Hawaii could make a valuable contribution to the programs of the United States for the promotion of international educational, cultural, and related activities.

1. In keeping with the views of the Hawaiian Community Advisory Committee, it should consist of two principal units, to be maintained, staffed, and operated by the University. These units would consist of (1) an International College offering academic programs and related services and (2) an International Training Center providing facilities for on-the-job, in-service, or field training. The principal officers of the Center would be the Director, the Dean of the International College, and the Director of the Training Center. The Director of the International Center would report directly to the President of the University.

2. To initiate a program for such a Center would require the provision as soon as possible of adequate housing and related facilities; its expansion would have to be commensurate with the growth of such facilities.

3. During the first three years, scholarships for students from Asian and Pacific areas as well as for those of the United States should be provided, and also grants for outstanding scholars, scientists, and other specialists and men of leadership in order to strengthen the program of the Center and demonstrate its potentialities.

4. The facilities, services, and resources of the Center should be made available at reasonable cost to all qualified students, scholars, agencies, and institutions interested in participating in its programs.

5. Appropriate advisory committees should be established to assure adequate liaison and policy and program guidance from the viewpoint of the participating or sponsoring agencies and institutions.

6. To carry out such a Plan would require special financial support, that is, support from sources other than and in addition to the Government and University of Hawaii.

7. Such special financial support, it is estimated, would amount to \$8,300,000. This would be distributed as follows: (a) a contribution to initial building costs; and during the first three years: (b) contributions toward operational expenses, (c) scholarships for 225 Asian and Pacific students and 75 American students, (d) grants to outstanding Asian, Pacific, and American scholars and other leaders, and (e) advisory services. (For detailed figures, see Appendix 7.)³

8. Regarding the possibility of special financial support from the Federal Government, no specific provision has been made for these needs in the budget for 1961. The Plan for the Center as it materializes can be called to the attention of agencies of the Government planning programs which might make use of available facilities. Some support for the Center might be possible also to the extent that it could be derived from grants available under programs authorized by general legislation. Thus, the University might further explore the possibilities of obtaining assistance for the necessary building under the loan program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency or under programs of assistance to educational institutions, like those currently proposed in H.R. 4267 or S. 1017, 86th Congress, First Session, 1959. For scholarships, fellowships, and other similar payments to or for students and other individuals, grants could be sought under the regular programs for which the Congress appropriates funds as authorized by the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended; Title III of Chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954; the National Defense Education Act; and other Acts cited specifically or in general terms in the legislation which has authorized this Report.

³ Not printed here.

The Task of Peaceful Cooperation

Remarks by George N. Shuster¹

Mr. Chairman, having listened with great interest to the resolution² presented by the distinguished delegate from the Soviet Union [N. M. Sissakian] and also to his remarks, I feel it incumbent upon me to make a statement somewhat more lengthy than would otherwise be the case. I should like to begin by recalling UNESCO's first meeting in this city, when a truly great man, whose life has been given to the cause of peace and upon whose body then lay a weariness born of duress in concentration camps, rose to express the hopes which were in all our hearts at that time, namely, that our joint victory would usher in freedom and a decent measure of human understanding. That man was Léon Blum, and I should like to dedicate to the memory of this son of France what I shall now say. My comment will be, of necessity, in a measure a response to my colleague of the Soviet Union but will also be, I fondly trust, something more than that.

Certainly no men desired more ardently peaceful and fruitful relations with the people of Russia than did Americans of my generation. We had been reared and we lived in the spirit of Tolstoy and Dostoevski, the two greatest masters of the human mind of their age and still among the oracles of our own. They seem to me far more important than sputniks and fleets of jet planes. How could anyone doubt that a people from which such men arose is a mighty people fed by the springs of both East and West? Why

¹ Made on Dec. 2 before the 55th meeting of the Executive Board of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, which met at Paris Nov. 24-Dec. 4. Dr. Shuster, who is president of Hunter College, was chairman of the U.S. delegation.

² UNESCO doc. 55 EX/DR.1/Rev. The Soviet resolution called for (1) a study of the needs of underdeveloped countries in the fields of education, science, and culture and (2) "a radical improvement of UNESCO's activities for consolidating peace and implementing the principles of peaceful co-existence."

should we not always have lamented the barriers which, during a long and evil time, made the Volga and Neva alien streams for us? It is, in retrospect, unfortunate that the Soviet Union was not present at the earlier conference of UNESCO, despite earnest and repeated requests from the Government of the United States. I note with very great satisfaction that there has been a change of climate, and I wish to take full cognizance of this before proceeding to be rather critical of the resolution which Professor Sissakian has introduced.

Problem of Illiteracy and Poverty

There are in this resolution, in the main, three considerations. The first is this: We are asked to assume that, as a result of disarmament, profusely large sums of money will be made available to relieve illiteracy and poverty throughout the world. God knows that no one could be more in favor of that possibility than we are, but I would say in all candor that we already know what these needs are. One of my colleagues, Professor Paulo Carneiro, for example, has informed us that not less than \$100 million a year for 10 years would be required to solve the problem of illiteracy in Latin America. There exist, at the United Nations and at all our own American agencies, documents galore which reflect the need—the dire, desperate need—of millions of people, to whom Chesterton refers, “thronging like the thousands up from under the sea.”

Our problem is not now to ask UNESCO what are the dimensions of illiteracy and poverty in the world. Our problem is first of all to say, “What can we now do in order to alleviate these difficulties?” And I can only tell you that (and I think here again I will revert to what Professor Carneiro said) there are not merely people in my country but in all the countries of the world who are giving of their substance daily to relieve this distress. He referred to the action taken by the bishops of the West German Federal Republic. We know of so many more—I will not take up your time enumerating them—but I merely want to make one illustration. Heaven knows that the people of Greece are poor enough, but not long ago we received from two villages in that country a donation which was sent to an American organization in the hope of improving the lot of school-children in India.

I want now, if I may, to say this about UNESCO and its work. Sometimes we think that there is nothing very glamorous about UNESCO. This may be true. It does not concern itself with traumatic and dramatic experiences but with the daily, nourishing, creative work of the human mind. Therefore I would say that we should be grateful for the fact that we have come so far.

The other evening, after a long series of meetings, I sat for a while reading the excellent study which our colleague, Mr. Gardner Davies, has devoted to the French poet Mallarmé, and my eye lighted on that poet's line: *Toute notre native amitié monotone*. This amicableness, this *amitié*, that we feel is native to the human spirit. It may be a bit monotonous at times. I, for my part, am not at all satisfied with what UNESCO now is. I want to see it have, in the major lines of its effort, much more imagination, much more power, much more money, and I am grateful for the fact that the men who are guiding its destiny share these views with me. I see no occasion at the present time for turning aside from the efforts to which we are devoted in order to prepare a totally different outlook for the Organization.

Principle of Peaceful Cooperation

Now I shall come to the other two proposals in Professor Sissakian's resolution, about which I shall be even more critical, regretfully enough. The first has to do with what he calls peaceful coexistence. Now “peaceful coexistence” is one term. We have preferred another term, which is “peaceful cooperation.” The difficulty is that “peaceful coexistence” has a history. It has a history which from our point of view is not too glamorous, and I want, for my part, to be certain that there has been a close in one section of the book of the past and that from this time forward the words “peaceful coexistence” will mean something else. I shall be explicit. There is a proposal in this resolution that we establish a conference to be held on the basis of parity between East and West. Now what in essence does this resolution seem to us to mean? It appears to us, and my country, to mean what we have often confronted in the United Nations, namely, a proposition that there be set up a kind of parity between the United States and Russia as a basis for a sort of summit meeting in which we can

formulate a doctrine we might be able to sell to or, if necessary, to impose upon the Organization.

Our concept, members of the Board, of peaceful cooperation is a totally different one. We don't want any UNESCO summit conference. We are deeply committed to the principle of the family of nations. We know that this family looks upon us often as the eldest child, who has inherited all the money and who is a little stingy about giving it away. We also know that members of the family sometimes are a bit exigent and expect of us things that we cannot supply. Nevertheless I wish, this afternoon, to reaffirm our faith in the family of nations and to tell you that what we mean by cooperation is this: that never will we consent to any kind of international intellectual organization in which the smallest one amongst us does not have equal rights to share in the discussion and to arrive at the conclusions. It is for this reason, primarily, that we do not favor any kind of meeting under the auspices of UNESCO which is based on a principle of parity.

There is another reason. From our point of view the United States is not a capitalistic country. We have in our opinion long ceased to be one, and for my part, if I may say so, I think that Karl Marx would have great difficulty in recognizing the Soviet Union as a socialist country of the sort he had in mind. If I speak now of a parity of socialist and capitalist countries, I am not merely being semantic but I am pointing out that just as there has been an inevitable trend in the whole field of disarmament there has been an equally inevitable trend in the field of sociological and economic development. Therefore, I say, why not accept our principle of peaceful cooperation, which means in essence that we will rededicate ourselves to the problems of freedom, of literacy, of emancipation from poverty insofar as education can make this possible and expend additional effort in developing brilliantly the ways in which we can attack these situations.

Sources of War Propaganda and Preparations

And now, finally, I want to revert to the last part of the proposal about which Professor Sissakian will pardon me if I say that I have some very serious reservations. This is the passage in his document which refers to the fact that we have to fight against preparations for and propaganda for another war. This also has a long and serious history.

For the past 10 years my country has been cast, and not by itself, in the role of the originator of this kind of propaganda. There have been dozens of international conferences which we have not attended in which every resolution that was passed called attention to the fact that from somewhere between Washington and New York there emanated a constant stream of declarations hostile to the cause of peace. Now I want to be sure, before I dedicate UNESCO to anything like this, that it, in turn, is not to participate in a conference of this character, that when we talk seriously, man to man, about propaganda for warfare and preparation for war, we will look present international situations squarely in the eye. Where is propaganda for war being made? Where is activity for the promotion of military effort taking place? If the proposal is to look honestly at the current sources of propaganda and of military preparation, I can assure Professor Sissakian that I will be present for that conference.

This then, I think, more or less summarizes my point of view. I have, however, a recommendation to make. This I am going to introduce with a quotation from Abraham Lincoln. This is the greatest testament of my country: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in." I agree that this work is the building of a peace for which all the peoples of the world ardently long and of which they constantly dream, and I am going to suggest that between now and the next General Conference the distinguished delegate from the Soviet Union and I, severally in our ways, draw up for consideration at the next General Conference a bill of particulars of what he would have UNESCO do in terms of the principle of peaceful coexistence and what I would have UNESCO do in terms of peaceful cooperation.

We will go home to our several countries. He can consult his great leader, and I will consult mine. We will not compare notes and perhaps no one could hope this more deeply than do I. And I repeat what I said at the outset: As I talk this afternoon I think of Léon Blum, and as I talk this afternoon I think of what I owe personally, and will owe every day of my life, to the inspiration of the great masters of Russian literature. I profoundly hope that, when we come back with the two lists of proposals which I have suggested this

afternoon, there will be so much agreement between us that UNESCO can then proceed to say, "At last we have opened an era in which a genuine measure of cooperation and friendship is possible." I shall even confess to Professor Sissakian that, being the kind of man I am, I shall go back to my homeland and pray daily that his list may be inspired with even greater wisdom than my own. It is in this spirit that I would like to conclude the remarks I wish to make on his resolution.

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Finance

Agreement establishing the Inter-American Development Bank, with annexes. Done at Washington April 8, 1959.

Signed and acceptances deposited: Colombia, December 21, 1959; Ecuador, December 22, 1959; El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama, December 29, 1959; Bolivia, Brazil, Costa Rica, Mexico, and Peru, December 30, 1959.

Entered into force: December 30, 1959.

Sugar

International sugar agreement of 1958. Done at London December 1, 1958. Entered into force provisionally January 1, 1959; definitively for the United States October 9, 1959.

Proclaimed by the President: December 31, 1959.

Ratifications and acceptances deposited: Costa Rica, June 23, 1959; Cuba (with reservation), June 15, 1959; Dominican Republic, June 3, 1959; Indonesia, November 6, 1959; Ireland, June 5, 1959.

Telecommunication

Telegraph regulations (Geneva revision, 1958) annexed to the international telecommunication convention of December 22, 1952 (TIAS 3266), with appendixes and final protocol. Done at Geneva November 29, 1958.

Proclaimed by the President: December 30, 1959.

Entered into force: January 1, 1960.

Trade and Commerce

Seventh protocol of rectifications and modifications to texts of the schedules to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva November 30, 1957.¹

Signature: Peru, December 4, 1959.

Declaration on relations between contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia. Done at Geneva May 25, 1959. Entered into force November 16, 1959; for the United States, November 19, 1959.

Signatures: Yugoslavia, May 25, 1959; France, May 30, 1959; Finland, June 18, 1959; Italy, July 7, 1959; Greece, July 9, 1959; Norway, July 14, 1959; Turkey, July 21, 1959; New Zealand, August 4, 1959; Belgium (subject to ratification), August 20, 1959; India and Indonesia, September 1, 1959; Ghana, September 9, 1959; Austria, September 22, 1959; Luxembourg, October 12, 1959; Netherlands and United Kingdom (but not in respect of the Protected State of Brunei)², October 19, 1959; Denmark, October 26, 1959; Czechoslovakia, Israel, and Sweden, October 29, 1959; Ceylon, October 31, 1959; Canada and Chile, November 6, 1959; Uruguay, November 9, 1959; Burma, November 11, 1959; Peru, November 16, 1959; Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, November 17, 1959; United States, November 19, 1959.

Ratification deposited: Belgium, September 16, 1959.

Declaration on the provisional accession of Israel to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva May 29, 1959. Entered into force October 9, 1959; for the United States December 19, 1959.

Signatures: Israel (subject to ratification), May 29, 1959; Greece, July 9, 1959; Norway, July 14, 1959; Turkey, August 6, 1959; Ghana, September 9, 1959; Austria (subject to ratification) and New Zealand, September 22, 1959; Belgium (subject to ratification) and Finland, October 6, 1959; France, October 9, 1959; Netherlands and United Kingdom (but not in respect of the Protected States of Abu Dhabi, Ajman, Bahrain, Brunei,³ Dubai, Fujairah, Kuwait, Qatar, Ras al Khaimah, Sharjah, and Ummal Quaiwan), October 19, 1959; Sweden, October 20, 1959; Nicaragua, October 30, 1959; Ceylon, October 31, 1959; Canada and Denmark, November 6, 1959; Uruguay, November 9, 1959; Burma, November 11, 1959; Peru, November 16, 1959; Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, and Union of South Africa, November 17, 1959; United States, November 19, 1959; Italy, December 7, 1959.

Ratification deposited: Israel, September 9, 1959.

Wheat

International wheat agreement, 1959, with annex. Opened for signature at Washington April 6 through 24, 1959. Entered into force July 16, 1959, for part I and parts III to VIII, and August 1, 1959, for part II. TIAS 4302.

Acceptance deposited: Mexico, December 30, 1959.

BILATERAL

Netherlands

Agreement further extending the agreement of August 6 and 16, 1956, as extended (TIAS 3650 and 3896), relating to the establishment and operation of rawinsonde observation stations in Curaçao and St. Martin. Effected by exchange of notes at The Hague July 21 and October 10, 1958. Entered into force October 10, 1958.

Switzerland

Agreement replacing schedule I (Swiss) annexed to the reciprocal trade agreement of 1936 (49 Stat. 3917). Effected by exchange of notes at Washington December 30, 1959. Entered into force January 1, 1960.

Turkey

Agreement further amending the agreement of November 15, 1954, as supplemented and amended (TIAS 3179, 3204, 3205, and 3414), for the exchange of commodities and sale of grain, with annex. Effected by exchange of notes at Ankara December 10, 1959. Entered into force December 10, 1959.

² Notification dated November 27, 1959, accepts declaration in respect of Protected State of Brunei.

¹ Not in force.

Agriculture. The State of the Union (Eisenhower)	111
American Republics. President Eisenhower To Visit South America	119
Aviation. United States and Netherlands Hold Civil Aviation Consultation (text of joint statement)	120
Canada	
Canadian-United States Cooperation for Peace (Wigglesworth)	121
IJC Reports on Development of Columbia River Basin	126
Communism. The State of the Union (Eisenhower)	111
Congress, The	
President Expresses Views on World Court and Disarmament (Eisenhower, Humphrey)	128
Secretary Sends Report to Congress on East-West Center in Hawaii (Herter)	130
The State of the Union (Eisenhower)	111
Cultural Exchange. Secretary Sends Report to Congress on East-West Center in Hawaii (Herter)	130
Disarmament. President Expresses Views on World Court and Disarmament (Eisenhower, Humphrey)	128
Economic Affairs	
Canadian-United States Cooperation for Peace (Wigglesworth)	121
IJC Reports on Development of Columbia River Basin	126
The State of the Union (Eisenhower)	111
France. President de Gaulle To Visit U.S.	120
International Law	
President Expresses Views on World Court and Disarmament (Eisenhower, Humphrey)	128
The State of the Union (Eisenhower)	111
U.S. and Mexican Officials Discuss Control of Illegal Drug Traffic (text of communique)	127
International Organizations and Conferences. The Task of Peaceful Cooperation (Shuster)	131
Mexico. U.S. and Mexican Officials Discuss Control of Illegal Drug Traffic (text of communique)	127
Military Affairs	
Canadian-United States Cooperation for Peace (Wigglesworth)	121
The State of the Union (Eisenhower)	111
Netherlands. United States and Netherlands Hold Civil Aviation Consultation (text of joint statement)	120
Presidential Documents	
President Expresses Views on World Court and Disarmament	128
The State of the Union	111
United States and Soviet Union Exchange New Year Greetings	119
Treaty Information	
Current Actions	134
United States and Netherlands Hold Civil Aviation Consultation (text of joint statement)	120
U.S.S.R. United States and Soviet Union Exchange New Year Greetings (Eisenhower, Khrushchev, Voroshilov)	119
<i>Name Index</i>	
De Gaulle, Charles	120
Eisenhower, President	111, 119, 128
Herter, Secretary	130
Humphrey, Hubert H	129
Khrushchev, Nikita S	119
Shuster, George N	131
Voroshilov, Kliment E	119
Wigglesworth, Richard B	121

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: January 4-10

Press releases may be obtained from the Office of News, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

Release issued prior to January 4, which appears in this issue of the BULLETIN is No. 885 of December 30.

No.	Date	Subject
†1	1/5	Consulate general at Cameroun elevated to embassy (rewrite).
2	1/5	U.S.-Mexico communique on narcotics control.
3	1/6	U.S.-Netherlands civil aviation talks.
†4	1/8	Delegate to ECE Steel Committee (rewrite).
†5	1/9	Dillon: departure for Paris economic talks.

† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.



the
Department
of
State

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)

Two new *Background* pamphlets on important areas . . .

THE SUBCONTINENT OF SOUTH ASIA

Afghanistan • Ceylon • India • Nepal • Pakistan

Lying on the edge of the free world, touched by the power of Communist Central Asia, the subcontinent of South Asia today has a crucial role in world affairs. The characteristics and problems of the subcontinent generally and the five sovereign nations in it are the subjects of a new *Background* pamphlet.

Publication 6839

40 cents

SOUTHEAST ASIA

Area of Challenge, Change, and Progress

From the isolation imposed by geography and a colonial pattern of control, most of the lands and peoples of Southeast Asia have recently been thrust into the midst of international politics mainly as a result of national movements which led them to independence. This 15-page illustrated pamphlet discusses the problems of this sudden transformation, and contains background information on the geography, peoples, and economic situation of the area. Brief descriptions are included of the individual countries of Southeast Asia—Burma, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaya, the Philippines, Thailand, and Viet-Nam.

Publication 6861

15 cents

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$ _____
(cash, check, or money
order payable to
Supt. of Docs.)

Please send me - - - - copies of —

- ☐ *The Subcontinent of South Asia—Afghanistan, Ceylon, India, Nepal, and Pakistan.*
☐ *Southeast Asia—Area of Challenge, Change, and Progress*

Name: - - - - -

Street Address: - - - - -

City, Zone, and State: - - - - -

